ment, by making it the guardian of special and local interests! This is a fine scheme for the development of a general and national policy. Senator Tillman seems also to be greatly excited. Here is his patriotic view of the question:

"Who gave Bryan the right to say who is and who is not a democrat? I am not worrying about what he or any one else says. I answer only to the people of my state. They will attend to me if I am not doing right, and I am willing to submit my record to them. I am against free raw material and believe, as Senator Bailey does, that such a policy is not democratic doctrine."

The same beautiful plan is in the mind of Tillman, namely to make the democratic party a sort of assistant "advance agent of prosperity." All there is to the party is a South Carolina machine to take care of the people of South Carolina. But the most interesting statement is by Senator Smith of Maryland:

"It appears to me that Mr. Bryan should give the democrats in congress an opportunity to work out the salvation of the party. He has had his opportunity to lead the party to victory and has utterly failed. We are trying to make a record in the senate which can be defended by the country, and Mr. Bryan should at least wait until the bill is passed before he begins to attack the members of his party in congress."

Well, Mr. Smith and the others have had their "opportunity to work out the salvation of the party," and they have used it in such a way as to make the party even weaker than it was before. A few days ago Governor Johnson had something to say of the democrats who were voting for protection in the senate, and, of course, he was "castigated" by the men involved. Now Mr. Bryan, acting as a private citizen, is impertinent enough to remind Messrs. Simmons, Smith, Tillman, Bailey and the rest that there is such a thing as a national democratic platform, and they at once fly into a rage, forgetting that their difference is not with Mr. Bryan but with their party. A few days ago Henry Watterson said that when he and his paper repudiated a party platform they did it before the election. In that utterance is contained the sufficient condemnation of Mr. Bailey, who is now trying to show that his party had no right to say what it did, no right to declare for free lumber, and that having no such right he is not bound by its utterance. We had no hint of any such thing during the campaign. It was not suggested till the tariff bill got before the senate. All the elaborate exposition of the raw material question will not serve to square matters. For the truth is that Mr. Bryan has put the case with perfect clearness

The Commoner.

noils should certainly bear no higher rate than the material of which they are a by-product, but if this were permitted they would be able to buy what they wanted from abroad and the worsted trust would lose a lot of very profitable customers. The carded woolen manufacturers have a national association, but are not in any trust. Their wishes have not been heeded in the least, therefore, and the new tariff bill will carry a rate made so high that it will return no revenue to the government, but will add materially to the revenues of the worsted trust. In addition, the absence of any demand from America for foreign noils enables the carded wool manufacturer abroad to buy the combings at his own price, a price so low that he can import his cheap woolen goods into this country and undersell the American manufacturer. President Dobson of the association says that this competition has had the effect of closing a number of mills in Philadelphia and elsewhere.

Thus we are given a demonstration of the uses to which the taxing power of the government is put, to compel the closing of those American mills that turn out the goods from which the cheap woolen clothing of the masses is made, and at the same time open the markets here to the foreign manfacturer, to whose original price must be added the duty his goods bear. That is assuredly a queer twist in the protective tariff theory, which, we have been so often told, means the opening of the American mill, the barring out of the foreign product and the cheapening of clothing to the masses. C. Q. D.

PATHETIC WAIL FROM A REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER

The Boston Herald was in 1908 a stalwart supporter of the republican ticket. In its issue of May 6 the Herald prints an editorial entitled "Preventing Prosperity." The editorial follows:

"It would be better to re-enact the Dingley bill forthwith, and then adjourn congress, than to continue the ridiculous discussion and the worse than foolish tinkering with the tariff now going on at Washington. The country is disgusted. It has waited in vain for some sign that the pledge of the republican party would be kept, a pledge made not only by the party in convention, but by the recent leader of the party, Mr. Roosevelt, and by the present leader, President Taft. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Taft is to be blamed for the hopeless breakdown of the party promise, nor is the mass of republicans throughout the country. To the blindness-some call it shrewdness-of the congressional leaders, their callous disregard of an enlightened public opinion, must be ascribed the plight in which the country finds itself, dragging in the muddle of tariff talk, the end of the course not yet in sight. "Senator Aldrich accuses Senator Dolliver of attempting to destroy the tariff. This ancient retort to advocates of tariff reform will convince nobody. Senator Aldrich declares that the country is waiting for the final passage of the tariff bill. Nobody will dispute that fact. But who, more than Senator Aldrich with his rising schedules, is delaying the passage of the bill? Who more than Senator Aldrich, with his cynical assertion that revision does not mean reduction, has done more to disgust the country with political tariff-tinkering; who has done more than he to place the republican party and the administration in a false position? "The business interests of the country, the employers and the employed, are wearied with all the uncertainty which this tariff agitation, with all its sophistry and intrigue, have brought upon all enterprise. The congressional leaders, entrusted with a great duty which they are sadly muddling, are blocking the business of the land. Were there an able and compact party of opposition this wretched state of things would not have come about. The dominant party would have been forced to make some sensible provision for the interest of the people. But no such provision seems to be contemplated. The so-called debates are a farce; the object diligently pursued is humbug. Those who, ourselves among the number, took the party at its word, and have tried to keep it to its word, may fairly say that it has broken faith with the country. To be sure, the tariff bill is not yet passed, but in the bill as it stands the intention of the congressional leaders is clear to all who read. To the call of the country congress is unresponsive. Senator Aldrich's derisive retort that although revision was promised, no promise was made for revision downward, may satisfy him, may satisfy the majority in the

senate, may rejoice the majority in the house, but the American people despise such plays with words, such juggling with the good faith of the electorate. Had there been no general belief that the promised revision meant reduction there would have been no general demand for revision; there would have been no special session of congress. If the men who are responsible for deluding the country do not change their present course there will come for them a day of political reckoning which they will rue. Great as may be their hardihood, they can not afford to be despised by their fellow-citizens.

"This prolonged play with the tariff is costing the country millions every day. The uncertainty it causes is the only bar to a speedy return to prosperity. Business generally is retarded because business men are compelled to hold back until a tariff bill is passed. Should the bill receive the veto of the president, the next condition would be worse than the present. There would be another six months, perhaps another year, of delay in which all enterprise would suffer. It would be better to re-enact the Dingley bill now, if that is what the standpatters intend, than, under the hypocritical pretense of revision, continue to depress the business of the nation under a lot of uncertainty.

"One good thing has come from all this pretense at reform. In every portion of the country business men who are affronted by the habit of making the tariff the football of contending political teams, demand the establishment of a tariff bureau free from partisan intrigue. It is from that direction that reform must come. The senate proposal for a tariff bureau or commission is only another preposterous humbug, for it would mean a political body dominated by partisanship. The business men of the United States are waking up to the folly of the practice which they have so long supported, a practice which periodically places them, their enterprises and their employes, at the mercy of political leaders who play the game for the sake of personal and partisan supremacy. The sympathy of the country is not now with congress. The congress is blind if it does not see the signs, foolhardy if seeing them it heeds them not."

.................. WHAT IS DEMOCRATIC? The democrats who have voted ۲ ۲ against free lumber have: 8 Voted to repudiate the national plat-۲ form of the democratic party; ۲ 0 Voted to encourage the destruction of ۲ our forests; Voted to raise the price of one of the chief necessaries of life; 0 Voted to tax a material that enters 0 \odot into a multitude of industries, and thus () \odot to place an unnecessary burden upon 0 ۲ 0 these industries; Voted to tax the people of the whole 0 \odot country for the benefit of a compara-0 \odot tively few owners of timber lands; and 0 0 0 Voted to tax a majority of their own 0 0 constituents for the benefit of a minority 0 () of those constituents. 0 To cast such a vote a democrat must 0 \odot have arguments that have not yet been 0 0 given to the public and must be pre- \odot 0 pared to present these arguments to his ۲ 0 0 constituents. The Commoner will give space (up to ۲ 0 two thousand words) to any democratic ۲ 0 senator or member of congress who de-۲ 0 sires to present an argument in favor of ۲ 0 a duty on lumber, provided he will in his ۲ ۲ article answer the following questions: 0 0 0

and fairness .- Indianapolis (Ind.) News.



Even the Wool Schedule

If there is one schedule in the tariff bill that ought to be sacred from vandal hands it is the wool schedule. For a good many years we have been impressed during campaigns with the necessity of protecting the owners of sheep herds. Yet we find there is a very violent dispute between the manufacturers over this precious item. It is all because the manufacture of wool comprises two branches, the worsted manufacturers who use the longer length and those cloth manufacturers who use the shorter ones.

The latter claim that the former is protected at their expense and in such an ingenious way that they are compelled to pay tribute to the users of worsted who, by a strange coincidence, happen to be in a trust. Woolen goods are manufactured from what are known as noils, which are the waste product of the longer fibres, the little knots and strands that are left after the wool has been combed.

The combing wools bear a low rate of duty, and the noils are taxed at just double that rate. That is to say, those parts of the wool that remain after the fibre has been treated to a thorough combing and twisting and which loses from 10 to 25 per cent of its weight in the cleaning and scouring process it afterwards undergoes, are made dutiable at so high a rate as to be prohibitive, so that the only recourse the woolen manufacturers who use the combings have is to buy from the worsted manufacturers.

The woolen manufacturers insist that the

First, Is a platform binding? Second, Is it wise to encourage the devastation of our forests?

0

0

۲

0

0

0

۲

۲

۲

۲

...

0

۲

0

Third, Will the country as a whole be benefited by a tariff on lumber, and if so, how?

Fourth, How many of his constituents produce lumber as compared with the number of his constituents who use lumber?

Fifth, Will he give the names of the
men who have by letter or in person
urged him to vote for the tariff on
lumber?

This "You-tickle-me-and-I'll-tickle-you" tariff revision is productive of a great deal of laughter—but not among those who are the victims of the policy.